

REMARKS

The Examiner's Office Action has been reviewed. The Examiner has objected to Claims 1, 2 and 10 for informalities. In response thereto, Claim 1 has been amended at lines 41-42 to correct "the extension members" to --the extension member--, and Claim 2 at line 15 and Claim 10 at line 16 have been amended to correct "the handle" to --a handle--.

The Examiner has then rejected Claim 2 "under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 2 of copending Application No. 10/701,811." In response thereto, applicant submits herewith a terminal disclaimer and has concurrently submitted a notice of express abandonment of Application No. 10/701,811 (copy attached).

The Examiner's advice that should Claims 2-8 be found allowable, Claim 10 will be objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate thereof is noted. The Examiner is advised that should Claims 2-8 be found allowable, applicant will cancel Claim 10.

Claim 9 has been objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim. Claim 9 has been rewritten herein in independent form as suggested by the Examiner.